

STUDENT-FOCUSED FUNDING

ADDED

ISA

GUIDELINES

2001-02

**This publication supplements the
*ISA Guidelines, 2001-02.***

Une publication équivalente est disponible en français sous le
titre suivant : *Allocation d'aide spécialisée (AAS).*
Lignes directrices pour l'AAS : Addenda 2001-02.

This publication is available on the Ministry of Education's
website at <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca>.



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose of the Intensive Support Amount (ISA)	2
The 2001–02 Comprehensive Review	3
Directions and How They Are Being Implemented	4
Clarified Eligibility Criteria	12
Profile 1.2/1.3 – Behaviour	13
Profile 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Preschool Children	15
Profile 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing, School-Age Students	17
Profile 3.2/3.3 – Learning Disability	19
Confidential Assessment Summary – Learning Disability	21
Profile 4.2/4.3 – Pervasive Developmental Disorder/Autism Spectrum Disorder	23
Profile 7.2/7.3 – Intellectual Disability	24
Confidential Assessment Summary – Intellectual Disability	26
Profile 8.2/8.3 – Blind and Deaf-Blind	28
Profile 9.2/9.3 – Physical/Health Disability	30
ISA Claims Validation Process for School Authorities	31
Disclosure of Confidential Student Information	32
Glossary of Terms	33



Introduction

The Ministry of Education is continuing its efforts to ensure that district school boards have the resources they need to support students with special needs. The intent of the 2001–02 Intensive Support Amount (ISA) comprehensive review is to make the funding process more stable, more responsive to need, and less of an administrative burden for school boards.

In November 2000, in response to concerns voiced by our education partners, the ISA Working Group was established with a mandate to develop recommendations to improve the ISA funding process. The working group includes representatives of provincial associations of trustees, supervisory officers, and senior business officers, as well as representatives of the Minister's Advisory Council on Special Education, the Ontario Parent Council, and the Provincial Parent Association Advisory Committee on Special Education Advisory Committees.

In January 2001, the ISA Working Group developed its first recommendations, which dealt with the directions that improvements to the ISA claims review process should take. The government announced its support for these directions in May 2001. The working group released its second set of recommendations in July 2001. These recommendations dealt with the details of implementing the 2001–02 ISA review process. Key recommendations included clarifying the eligibility criteria for each ISA profile, establishing a baseline of ISA-eligible files that reflects each board's demonstrated need, and allowing boards to submit ISA claims over an extended period of validation cycles.

This document sets out the ministry's directions for the 2001–02 ISA comprehensive review process and explains how they will be implemented. The directions and the details of their implementation reflect the working group's recommendations.

Purpose of the Intensive Support Amount (ISA)

The Ministry of Education's Special Education Grant has two components:

- the Special Education Per Pupil Amount (SEPPA), which is a standard per pupil amount based on each board's total enrolment, and
- the Intensive Support Amount (ISA), which is a variable amount based on the proportion of each board's students with very high needs.

The goal of the ISA is to provide boards with special education funding that responds to the proportion of their students who have very high needs that must be met with costly programs and supports. The ISA eligibility profiles, therefore, are not meant to be used for all children with special needs. (Special-needs students make up approximately 10% of the total student population.) They are specifically intended to be used by boards for only a small subset of the special-needs student population.

ISA funding does not determine programming for special-needs students. Although individual student files are reviewed to determine each board's proportion of high-needs students, ISA funding is not allocated on a student-specific basis.

Boards are responsible for providing each student with special needs with the program and support levels outlined in the student's Individual Education Plan. The ISA validation results and the SEPPA are vehicles the ministry uses to establish a board's overall allocation for special education. Boards use these allocations (and other allocations such as the Foundation Grant) to provide special education programs and services for all their students with special needs.

The 2001–02 Comprehensive Review

The comprehensive review process will result in the creation, for each board, of a new baseline of ISA-eligible files that reflects the board's demonstrated level of need.

The review will begin in November 2001 and end in December 2002, allowing boards to submit ISA claims over four validation cycles.

The eligibility criteria for ISA claims made under each profile have been clarified to make it easier for boards and validators to interpret them consistently and to make the claims process more equitable.

The new claims process includes a procedure that allows certain ISA files that were found eligible in the 2000 ISA claims process to be "grandparented" – that is, boards will not have to resubmit these files for the 2001–02 and future claims processes. Files will be grandparented provided that a board's overall approval rate for each profile in the 2000 review meets a 90% threshold. This new procedure will allow approximately one third of all ISA files that were eligible in 2000 to be moved directly to a baseline of eligible files, significantly reducing boards' administrative work.

The ministry will provide improved, comprehensive training to board staff and validators on the clarified ISA eligibility criteria under each profile and on the new review process.

While boards' baselines are being established, boards will receive stable funding for the 2001–02 school year. The comprehensive review is structured so that early indications of the fiscal implications of the review will be available in time to inform the Ministry of Education's 2002–03 grant regulation process. These early fiscal implications will help ministry staff develop options and recommendations for student-focused funding for the 2002–03 school year. One option may be to move to "live" funding (funding allocations that are based exclusively on the results of the ISA claims review process) for the 2002–03 school year if a specific board's ISA results are higher than its existing levels under stable funding.

Following completion of the comprehensive review and the establishment of a new baseline of ISA-eligible files for each board, the ministry will review the overall funding impacts for 2003–04 and develop options in consultation with boards and provincial associations.

After their baseline of ISA-eligible files has been established, boards will need to claim only new files each year. This process is expected to reduce boards' administrative burden in future years.

The comprehensive review is explained in detail on the following pages.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
1. Use clarified ISA eligibility profiles to support the 2001–02 comprehensive review.	■ The ISA Eligibility Group, a sub-group of the ISA Working Group, pilot-tested the clarified ISA eligibility profiles with 12 district school boards in May and June 2001. The pilot tests demonstrated more consistency and better approval rates. ■ The group also consulted with provincial associations and other stakeholders about the clarified profiles, and reviewed all comments received from these groups and from district school boards. ■ Final versions of the clarified ISA profiles will be used to support the 2001–02 comprehensive review process.
2. Grandparent as many files as possible into a starting baseline of ISA-eligible files using a 90% threshold approval rate (calculated separately for each profile), prior to the start of the 2001–02 comprehensive ISA review.	■ To reduce the administrative effort required of boards by the comprehensive ISA review process, boards' results from the 2000 ISA review will be used to help establish a starting baseline of ISA-eligible files that more accurately reflects each board's demonstrated level of need. The objective is to add as many files as possible to the baseline. This objective will be achieved by "grandparenting" eligible files – that is, transferring them to the baseline – as outlined below. (a) Files reviewed and approved in 2000 will automatically be grandparented into a board's baseline of eligible files. The board will not need to resubmit these files in future years (with the exception noted below concerning profile 3 [learning disabilities]). (b) Files reviewed and approved in the pilot-test of May/June 2001 will automatically be grandparented into a board's baseline of eligible files, with no need for the board to resubmit them. (c) Files that were submitted in the 2000 ISA review but not reviewed will be grandparented into a board's baseline of eligible files <i>if they meet a 90% threshold approval rate</i> (calculated separately for each profile), with no need for the board to resubmit them. (Files reviewed and found ineligible during the 2000 review will be excluded as ineligible). This means that all files claimed under a particular profile will be grandparented (with the exception of files reviewed and found ineligible), provided that a board's overall approval rate for that profile in the 2000 review meets the 90% threshold.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	Note: Because of the extent of the changes to Profile 3 (Learning Disabilities), it is not possible to use the results of the 2000 review for grandparenting purposes. No files submitted under Profile 3 will be grandparented into the baseline. ■ The calculation that determines whether boards meet the 90% threshold approval rate for each profile has been designed to allow the maximum number of files to enter the baseline. For example, the 90% threshold can be applied against each ISA profile or separately by ISA levels 2 and 3 within each profile, whichever calculation results in a higher number of grandparented files province-wide. ■ This process will allow at least one-third of all ISA files that were eligible in 2000 to be directly transferred into the baseline. ■ Claims submitted on behalf of students who have left the Ontario school system will <i>not</i> be grandparented into a board's baseline. For those students who move within the system, portability adjustments will be applied to each board's baseline of ISA-eligible files. ■ Rounding (on a whole-file basis) will be used to determine whether a board's overall approval rate meets the 90% threshold approval rate for grandparenting. For example, if a board needs to have 72.3 files eligible under a particular profile to meet the 90% threshold approval rate, 72 eligible files will be considered sufficient. ■ The ministry will send each school board a list of all ISA files that meet the above criteria for grandparenting and that <i>do not need to be resubmitted</i> in advance of the comprehensive claim review. ■ Once a file has been approved and added to a board's baseline (as a result of either the grandparenting process or the comprehensive review), the board will not have to resubmit it in future reviews. Boards will only claim new files in future years, for those students who are new to the school system or for students whose needs have changed. The grandparenting process thus significantly reduces the annual administrative effort required by boards to apply for ISA funding.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	■ The ministry may choose in future years to implement a periodic review of all files or of files submitted under some profiles. If so, the ministry will consult with boards and associations on the process to be used.
3. Allow boards to choose to resubmit files reviewed in 2000 in cycle 1 of the comprehensive review for the purpose of grandparenting files from the 2000 review.	■ To maximize the number of ISA files entering the baseline directly, boards may resubmit, during the first validation cycle of the 2001–02 comprehensive review, files that were reviewed in the 2000 ISA audit. (Validation cycles are described under item 5, below.) Ministry of Education validators will revalidate these files against the clarified ISA eligibility profiles. If higher approval rates can be achieved using the clarified profiles, the higher rates will be applied for the purpose of grandparenting files. ■ Similarly, if pilot-test validation results are higher for boards than the approval rates from the 2000 review, the pilot-test rates will be applied for the purpose of grandparenting files.
4. For the purpose of grandparenting files, treat claims submitted as ISA level 3 but approved as ISA level 2 in the 2000 audit as approved files.	■ Many files in the 2000 audit were submitted by boards at the ISA 3 level, but were adjusted by validators to be eligible at the ISA 2 level. Almost every board had files that were adjusted in this way, but the proportion of adjusted files varied greatly from board to board. Many boards had a significant proportion of adjusted files; almost half of boards had more than 20% of their files adjusted by validators. The number of adjusted files and their distribution among boards has created a challenge for the ministry related to the grandparenting of eligible files in this category. The ministry will take the following approach, which was devised to resolve this issue as fairly as possible. ■ Any claims submitted and reviewed as ISA level 3, but approved as ISA level 2, during the 2000 ISA audit will be treated, during the 2001–02 comprehensive review, as ISA level 2 claims for the purposes of grandparenting files into the baseline. ■ To calculate each board's threshold approval rates for the purposes of assigning files from the 2000 review into the baseline, adjusted files will be treated as approved files (that is, as if they had been claimed at the ISA 2 level).

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	■ Where a given profile passes the 90% threshold approval rate (including adjusted files), the ministry will randomly assign ISA 2 status to ISA 3 claim files that are grandparented as eligible but that were not reviewed in the 2000 audit. ISA levels will be randomly assigned to individual files, based on the percentage of the total number of approved 2000–01 claims that were claimed as level 3 but adjusted to level 2. The calculations will be made on a profile-by-profile basis. To treat boards equitably, and to allow boards the maximum opportunity to reduce their administrative burdens related to the review, the ministry will provide boards with the following choice: – Boards may accept the random assignment of ISA level status and have these files grandparented into the baseline. Files included in the baseline in this way cannot be resubmitted during the 2001–02 comprehensive review. OR – Boards may choose to place none of these files in the baseline, and resubmit the entire set of the files claimed in 2000 (for that profile) for one of the four validation cycles of the comprehensive review. ■ If a board accepts the first choice – random assignment of ISA level status for the purposes of the comprehensive review – it could resubmit the entire set of files that were claimed in 2000 (for that profile) in a future year following the comprehensive review.
5. Allow boards to submit claims over four validation cycles between November 2001 and December 2002.	■ Validations will occur on site at board offices. The ministry will send district school boards a schedule of board visits to be made by validators for the 2001–02 comprehensive ISA review. ■ The 2001–02 comprehensive review will consist of four validation cycles, listed below. Boards will prepare and submit claims for all ISA files (not already grandparented) that they believe meet the clarified ISA eligibility criteria. Boards may submit all of these claims in one cycle, or they may spread their submission over two or more cycles.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	Cycle 1 – Boards submit files by November 30, 2001. – Ministry of Education validators review files as soon as they are available, beginning November 19, 2001, and continuing until January 18, 2002. Cycle 2 – Boards submit files by February 15, 2002. – Ministry validators review files between March 4, 2002, and April 26, 2002. Cycle 3 – Boards submit files by May 10, 2002. – Ministry validators review files between May 27, 2002, and June 28, 2002. Cycle 4 – Boards submit files by November 2, 2002. – Ministry validators review files between November 19, 2002, and December 21, 2002. ■ Once a file has been reviewed and approved by ministry validators, it will be moved into the board's baseline of ISA-eligible files. ■ During cycle 1 and/or cycle 2, for each large board that has a significant number of ISA claims, the ministry will sample a statistically representative portion of files selected at random from the entire population of files, stratified by profile, that were submitted by the board. Where the files reviewed for particular profiles meet or exceed the 90% threshold approval rate, all the files claimed for that profile during that validation cycle will enter the baseline. ■ In each validation cycle, the ministry will follow a structured method for measuring the extent to which boards encounter difficulties in gaining access to professional assessments and/or in providing the required levels of intensive support. The results from this analysis during cycle 1 will be reviewed by the ISA Working Group in early December 2001. If the working group finds evidence that boards are experiencing significant difficulties in these areas, it will consider options for corrective action.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	■ If a file is not approved by ministry validators during a cycle of the 2001–02 comprehensive review, it can only be resubmitted (for example, with updated documentation) <i>once</i> during a subsequent validation cycle. In those instances where a validator believes that an ineligible file would be approved if it contained additional information, the validator will put a notation on the file indicating the missing documentation or other requirements. A board will then be required to submit only the additional information requested by the validator in a subsequent validation cycle. ■ At the close of each board visit during a validation cycle, validators will conduct exit discussions with board staff and will provide the board with a summary of the eligibility status of all files reviewed. Shortly after each visit and once all data has been verified, ministry staff will send boards a list of all the files added to the baseline (files that were reviewed and approved, as well as files that were found eligible as a result of extrapolations from sampling where relevant).
6. Send boards and SEAC chairs information about the process for the 2001–02 comprehensive ISA review.	■ Boards and chairs of Special Education Advisory Committees have requested detailed information about the comprehensive review process and the method for grandparenting ISA files into the baseline. This document contains that information. The ministry will release it in August 2001.
7. Clarify the “live” funding consequences to school boards during the comprehensive review and for 2002–03 and 2003–04.	In 2001–02: ■ Funding will remain stable in 2001–02 while the comprehensive review is being conducted. Each board’s ISA allocation for 2000–01 will be maintained as a floor (adjusted for portability). In 2002–03: ■ The timing of the cycles in the comprehensive review will allow the government to consider the option of allowing any board whose ISA results are higher than current stable funding levels by the end of cycle 1 (mid-January 2002) to move to “live” funding in 2002–03.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	■ The ISA Working Group will meet in early December 2001 to review the progress of the 2001–02 comprehensive review and to discuss any key issues that emerge, along with options for corrective action if required. ■ The ISA Working Group will also meet in January 2002 following completion of cycle 1 to discuss the results of the review to date and the financial impacts for boards. The working group will provide ministry staff with advice as funding recommendations for the government are developed during the 2002–03 grant regulation process. The working group will consider ISA level 2 and level 3 per-file funding amounts, the per-file amounts for deaf and blind students, and the impact of new students entering the school system. ■ This process will lead to recommendations related to the government’s 2002–03 approach to funding boards whose funding would increase if funding were “live” in 2002–03, as well as boards that will not have completed the comprehensive review process in time for “live” funding adjustments for the 2002–03 school year. In 2003–04: ■ After the new baseline is complete, the ministry will consult with boards and provincial associations about the impact of funding boards based on their demonstrated level of ISA-eligible files. The ministry will review this impact and develop options, if necessary, to address the whole allocation for special education (including per-file ISA funding amounts, per-file amounts for deaf and blind students, and SEPPA). ■ All boards will move to “live” ISA funding for 2003–04 based on the results of the comprehensive review.
8. Improve training for school boards on the 2001–02 ISA review process.	■ The ministry will hold a one-day preliminary information session on the 2001–02 comprehensive review process for superintendents responsible for special education and board finance. The workshop will be held in Toronto on August 23, 2001.

Directions	How They Are Being Implemented
	■ The ministry will also hold a three-day comprehensive training session for special education board administrators, as well as board psychologists and ministry validators. This session will be held in Toronto August 27 through August 29, 2001. Members of both the ISA Working Group and its Eligibility Group will participate to ensure that the session addresses all concerns. ■ Staff from the ministry's district offices, from provincial schools, and from school authorities will also be invited to attend the training session.
9. Ensure that school boards have appropriate supports throughout the 2001-02 comprehensive ISA review.	■ The ministry will provide boards with supporting material that boards will need throughout the 2001-02 comprehensive review, including: - a glossary of terms, questions and answers (Q's & As), and a best practices guide for the preparation of files for each ISA eligibility profile - an interactive website dedicated to ISA Q's & As - a telephone help line offering advice from ministry staff and validators - contact names for ministry staff and validators - a contact list of professionals for French-language, northern and rural boards The above materials will also be provided to the chairs of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Special Education and to chairs of Special Education Advisory Committees.
10. Clarify the use of Individual Education Plans (IEPs), timetables, and Staff Support Worksheets (SSWs) in relation to the 2001-02 comprehensive ISA review process.	■ For files submitted in cycle 1 of the comprehensive review, boards may use IEPs and timetables from 2000-01. ■ For files submitted in cycles 2 through 4, boards must generate new or updated IEPs and timetables for the 2001-02 school year to support all ISA claims. Note that the ISA claim and validation process is separate and apart from the process for monitoring a board's compliance with IEP standards. ■ Boards are <i>not</i> required to complete SSWs in support of claims put forward during the 2001-02 comprehensive review.

Clarified Eligibility Criteria

The following pages show the clarified eligibility criteria for ISA claims, by profile.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 1.2/1.3 - Behaviour

Claims that meet this profile represent a student whose behaviour threatens the safety of self and/or others and who requires a significant amount of supervision during the school day.

Evidence of:

Level 2

- ☐ An assessment report by a member of the College of Psychologists, a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or a Social Worker that identifies and describes the behaviour difficulties;

AND

- ☐ Within the current or past school year, documentation (e.g., assessments, suspension letters, teacher/principal anecdotal reports) that provides evidence of inappropriate behavioural, social, and/or emotional responses that are of such severity in terms of frequency, intensity, and duration that the student's educational performance and/or the learning of other students is adversely affected.

Level 3

- ☐ The above evidence for Level 2; and

- ☐ One of the following

- ☐ An assessment report by a member of the College of Psychologists or the College of Physicians and Surgeons which **must** include a formal diagnosis of a behaviour disorder (Oppositional Defiant Disorder [DSM-IV 313.81], Conduct Disorder [DSM-IV 312.8], Disruptive Behaviour Disorder Not Otherwise Specified [DSM-IV 312.9]);

OR

- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Psychologists or the College of Physicians and Surgeons of a disorder that is having a severe impact on behaviour (ADHD, Tic Disorders, Schizophrenia and other Psychotic Disorders, Mood Disorders, Anxiety Disorders, Personality Disorders, Adjustment Disorders, Problems Related to Abuse or Neglect, Pervasive Developmental Disorders).

ISA LEVEL 2

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

- ☐ Engages in behaviour that threatens the safety of self and/or others; **and**
- ☐ For a period of at least 6 consecutive months during the current or past school year, demonstrates repetitive, persistent, and ongoing behaviours, including **four or more** of the following:
- ☐ bullies others verbally and/or physically
 - ☐ disrupts learning of other students
 - ☐ destroys belongings of self and others
 - ☐ uses profanity excessively
 - ☐ fights with others without provocation
 - ☐ is argumentative with adults
 - ☐ defies or refuses to comply with adult requests and rules
 - ☐ demonstrates problems with self-control
 - ☐ is spiteful or vindictive
 - ☐ demonstrates poor frustration tolerance; easily angered
 - ☐ demonstrates self-injurious behaviour

ISA LEVEL 3

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

- ☐ Engages in behaviour that threatens the safety of self and/or others; **and**
- ☐ For a period of at least 6 consecutive months during the current or past school year, demonstrates repetitive, persistent, and ongoing behaviours, including four or more of the following:
- ☐ bullies others verbally and/or physically
 - ☐ threatens others with bodily harm
 - ☐ demonstrates physical cruelty and shows little or no remorse
 - ☐ destroys property
 - ☐ lies and/or steals
 - ☐ demonstrates truancy as documented by the school attendance counsellor
 - ☐ leaves school premises without permission unless constantly supervised
 - ☐ shows intolerance and lack of empathy
 - ☐ exhibits significant problems with anger management
 - ☐ makes suicidal statements, gestures, attempts
 - ☐ demonstrates poor frustration tolerance
 - ☐ has a documented history of substance abuse
 - ☐ demonstrates self-injurious behaviour

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 1.2/1.3 - Behaviour (continued)

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher, and
- ☐ Program includes alternative curriculum expectations for the development of:
 - ☐ behaviour management skills and
 - ☐ social skills

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and
- ☐ Program includes alternative curriculum expectations for the development of:
 - ☐ behaviour management skills and
 - ☐ social skills

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher and in combination with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., educational assistant, child and youth worker, psychologist, social worker, behaviour consultant), and that the combined support is provided for a total of 50% or more of the school day.

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher and in combination with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, psychologist, social worker, behaviour consultant), and that the combined support is provided for a total of 80% or more of the school day.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Claims that meet this profile represent a child who has a bilateral hearing loss and who requires amplification or specialized communication supports.

Preschool Children – Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or an assessment report by an audiologist who is a member of the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of:
 - ☐ a bilateral hearing loss for ISA Level 2;
 - ☐ a severe to profound bilateral hearing loss of at least 71dB for ISA Level 3;
- AND**
- ☐ A report documenting the use of amplification or specialized communication supports;
- AND**
- ☐ Admittance to a special education program for the hearing-handicapped as per Regulation 298, section 30, under the Education Act.

Note: Students with a cochlear implant require a pre-implant audiogram that demonstrates the criteria.

ISA LEVEL 2	ISA LEVEL 3
Preschool Children – Evidence of: ☐ Attainment of the age of 2 by Dec. 31st of the school year entering the program; and ☐ One of the following: ☐ Weekly visits by a qualified teacher of the deaf employed by the school board; ☐ Attendance in a school-based program.	Preschool Children – Evidence of: ☐ Attainment of the age of 2 by Dec. 31st of the school year entering the program; and ☐ Daily attendance in a school-based program.
Preschool Children – Evidence of Needs and Program: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school; and ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; and ☐ Program includes expectations that address the identified language development needs of the child.	Preschool Children – Evidence of Needs and Program: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school; and ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; and ☐ Program includes expectations that address the identified language development needs of the child.

**Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing
PRESCHOOL CHILDREN (continued)**

Preschool Children – Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ Program and timetable indicate **weekly** visits by a qualified teacher of the deaf employed by the school board; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file;

OR
- ☐ Program and timetable indicate attendance in a school-based program; **and**
- ☐ **One of the following:**
 - ☐ Program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file;

OR

 - ☐ Support is provided by staff from the appropriate provincial school.

Preschool Children – Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ Program and timetable indicate attendance in a school-based program for **50% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
- ☐ **One of the following:**
 - ☐ Program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file;

OR

 - ☐ Support is provided by staff from the appropriate provincial school.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing SCHOOL-AGE STUDENTS

Claims that meet this profile represent a student who has a significant bilateral hearing loss and who requires amplification or specialized communication supports.

School-Age Students – Evidence of:

- ☐ Within the past 2 years, a formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or an assessment report by an audiologist who is a member of the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of
 - ☐ a moderate to severe bilateral hearing loss of at least 31dB for ISA Level 2;
 - ☐ a severe to profound bilateral hearing loss of at least 71dB for ISA Level 3;

AND

- ☐ A report documenting the use of amplification or specialized communication supports.

Note: Students with a cochlear implant require a pre-implant audiogram that meets the above criteria.

ISA LEVEL 2	ISA LEVEL 3
School-Age Students – Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) Significant difficulty with: ☐ Developing communication and language without significant accommodations and/or modifications; and ☐ Accessing the curriculum without the intervention of a qualified teacher of the deaf	School-Age Students – Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) Consistent, extreme difficulty with: ☐ Developing communication and language without extensive accommodations and/or modifications; and ☐ Accessing the curriculum without the intervention of a qualified teacher of the deaf
School-Age Students – Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school; and ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations, as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; and ☐ Program includes curriculum expectations that address the identified language development needs of the student	School-Age Students – Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school; and ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations, as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; and ☐ Program includes curriculum expectations that address the identified language development needs of the student

**Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 2.2/2.3 – Deaf/Hard of Hearing
SCHOOL-AGE STUDENTS (continued)**

**School-Age Students – Evidence of
Intensive Support Required:**

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the deaf for **25% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file;

OR

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school in conjunction with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., qualified special education teacher, sign-language and/or oral interpreter, real-time captioner, notetaker, education assistant proficient in the student's primary mode of communication) for a total of **25% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file.

**School-Age Students – Evidence of
Intensive Support Required:**

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the deaf for **50% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file;

OR

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the deaf or staff from the appropriate provincial school in conjunction with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., qualified special education teacher, sign-language and/or oral interpreter, real-time captioner, notetaker, education assistant proficient in the student's primary mode of communication) for a total of **50% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf are included in the ISA file.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 3.2/3.3 – Learning Disability

Claims that meet this profile represent a student who is diagnosed with a learning disability and who demonstrates significant difficulty with academic achievement and behaviours that affect learning.

Evidence of:

Level 2

- ☐ An ISA Confidential Assessment Summary (Learning Disability) completed by a member of the College of Psychologists that documents all of the following based on information collected within the same **18-month period**
- ☐ The highest obtained IQ or Composite score falls within the Average range (25th percentile or higher) **and**
 - ☐ A score on one or more measures of psychological processing* logically related to the academic difficulty (e.g. phonological processing, memory, attention, processing speed, language processing, perceptual-motor processing, visuo-spatial processing, executive functioning) falls at least **1.5** standard deviations below the IQ or Composite score reported above; **and**
 - ☐ One or more scores on a standardized test of skills related to academic achievement* (oral language, reading, written language, mathematics) is at least **2** standard deviations below the IQ or Composite score reported above; **and**
 - ☐ A formal diagnosis of a learning disability.

OR

- ☐ An assessment report by a member of the College of Psychologists that documents the above criteria based on information collected within the same **18-month period**.

Level 3

- ☐ The evidence for Level 2; **and**
- ☐ A formal diagnosis of a disorder or medical condition that significantly exacerbates the problems with learning
- ☐ by a member of the College of Psychologists or a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of one of the following comorbid disorders: Attention-Deficit and Disruptive Behaviour Disorders, Tourette's, Anxiety or Mood Disorder;
- OR**
- ☐ by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of a medical condition that affects learning: e.g. Cerebral Palsy, Spina Bifida, Hydrocephalus, Acquired Brain Injury, Epilepsy, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

* Some of these data may be provided in supporting assessment documentation (e.g., multidisciplinary assessment, speech/language assessment, educational assessment).

ISA LEVEL 2	ISA LEVEL 3
Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, IEP, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) ☐ Significant delay in current academic achievement relative to curriculum expectations for the student's appropriate age/grade placement; and ☐ Behaviours that significantly affect learning (e.g., temper outbursts, inappropriate social behaviour, social isolation or peer rejection, forgetfulness, significant motor difficulties, clumsiness, attention difficulties).	Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, IEP, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) ☐ Meets both criteria for Evidence of Related Difficulties in Level 2; and ☐ Demonstrates all, or almost all of the time, one of the following: ☐ inattention and impulsivity ☐ difficulty with self-control ☐ anxiety ☐ depression ☐ behaviours resulting from a medical condition that interferes with the learning process (e.g., seizures, balance or gait problems, speech/language difficulties)

**Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 3.2/3.3 – Learning Disability
(continued)**

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; **and**
- ☐ Program includes significant accommodations to demonstrate achievement of the expectations; **and**
- ☐ Modified and/or alternative curriculum expectations for **51% to 80%** of the program to address:
 - ☐ achievement of curriculum expectations in areas of identified need, including organizational strategies for spoken or written thoughts and/or time management; **and**
 - ☐ behaviour management skills; **and**
 - ☐ self-advocacy skills

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Meets all **three** criteria for evidence of curriculum needs identified in IEP in Level 2 with modified and/or alternative curriculum expectations for **81% to 100%** of the program; **and**
- ☐ Program includes goals and expectations to address **one** of the following:
 - ☐ inattention and impulsivity
 - ☐ difficulty with self-control
 - ☐ anxiety
 - ☐ depression
 - ☐ behaviours resulting from a medical condition that interferes with the learning process (e.g., seizures, balance or gait problems, speech difficulties)

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; **and**
- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that specialized support personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, psychologist, qualified speech/language pathologist, social worker, behaviour consultant) provide frequent support during the school day to address the identified needs.

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified special education teacher for a minimum of **25%** of the instructional day; **and**
- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, psychologist, qualified speech/ language pathologist, social worker, behaviour consultant) provide almost constant support during the school day to address the identified needs.

CONFIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

(Learning Disability)

Student Number: _____

Last Name of Student:	First Name:	Gender	DOB (dd / mm / yyyy)	
		☐ M ☐ F		
Address:				
School Name:		Grade/ Placement:		

☐ **DIAGNOSIS OF A LEARNING DISABILITY (LEVEL 2)**

Diagnosed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
 Profession:¹ _____

AND

☐ **DIAGNOSIS OF A COMORBID OR CO-EXISTING DISORDER OR CONDITION (LEVEL 3)**

Diagnosis: _____
Diagnosed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
 Profession:¹ _____

¹ Must be a member of either the College of Psychologists or the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario.

SUPPORTING TEST DATA

☐ **INTELLECTUAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

(One composite score [see Glossary] must be at or above the 25th percentile.)

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
 Title: _____

Test	Type of Score ² (e.g., FSIQ, VIQ, GCA)	Percentile

² WISC-III scores must be based on Canadian norms

☐ **INFORMATION PROCESSING RESULTS**

(Scores must be 1.5 standard deviations below the highest score reported above. Intellectual and information processing results must have been obtained within 18 months of each other.)

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
 Title: _____

THIS SUMMARY IS CONFIDENTIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE REPRODUCED.

LAST NAME, First Name _____
DOB: [dd/mm/yyyy] _____

Test	Date Assessed	Standard Score	Percentile	Ability-Information Processing Discrepancy (in SD units)

☐ **ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS**

(One or more of the following scores must be at least 2 standard deviations lower than the highest estimate of intellectual ability reported above. Intellectual and achievement scores must have been obtained within 18 months of each other.)

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
Title: _____

Test	Subtest	Date Assessed	Standard Score	Percentile	Ability-Achievement Discrepancy (in SD units) ³

³ For WISC-III/WIAT discrepancies, U.S. norms must be used on the WISC-III to calculate the discrepancy, employing the simple difference method.

I⁴ attest to the accuracy of this information:

Name (please print)

Title

Signature

Date

⁴ Must be a member of the College of Psychologists.

THIS SUMMARY IS CONFIDENTIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE REPRODUCED.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 4.2/4.3 – Pervasive Developmental Disorder/Autism Spectrum Disorder (PDD/ASD)

Claims that meet this profile represent a student who has been diagnosed with a Pervasive Developmental Disorder (PDD)/Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) with significant associated communication, socialization, and behaviour problems.

Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis of a Pervasive Developmental Disorder (DSM-IV)/Autism Spectrum Disorder by a member of the College of Psychologists or the College of Physicians and Surgeons

AND

- ☐ Professional assessment* reports that indicate communication, social, and behaviour difficulties that will have a negative impact on school performance.

* E.g., multidisciplinary assessment, speech/language assessment, educational assessment, psychological assessment

ISA LEVEL 1	ISA LEVEL 3
Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation). Frequent difficulty with: ☐ Communication skills; and ☐ Social skills; and ☐ Self-regulation (ability to demonstrate age- and situationally appropriate emotions/behaviours).	Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation). Difficulty all, or almost all, of the time with: ☐ Communication skills (typically non-verbal); and ☐ Social skills; and ☐ Self-regulation (ability to demonstrate age- and situationally appropriate emotions/behaviours); and ☐ Behaviour(s) that threaten(s) the safety of self and/or others.
Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ Modified and/or alternative curriculum expectations for 51% to 80% of the program to address: ☐ communication skills; and ☐ social skills; and ☐ behaviour management skills.	Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ Alternative curriculum expectations for 81% to 100% of the program to address: ☐ communication skills (typically non-verbal); and ☐ social skills; and ☐ behaviour management skills.
Evidence of Intensive Support Required: ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, qualified speech/language pathologist) provide frequent support to address the identified needs.	Evidence of Intensive Support Required: ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, qualified speech/language pathologist) provide almost constant support to address the identified needs.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 7.2/7.3 – Intellectual Disability

Claims that meet this profile represent a student with an intellectual disability that requires a program that focuses on the student's development of social skills, basic living skills, and self-control skills, and, as appropriate, the acquisition of academic skills.

Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis of developmental disability (DSM-IV 318.0, 318.1, 318.2 or 319) by either a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or a member of the College of Psychologists;
- OR
- ☐ An assessment report by a member of the College of Psychologists that demonstrates an overall estimate of intellectual ability (e.g., Full-Scale IQ) at or below the **first** percentile; **and**
- ☐ Within the past **two** years, an assessment report documenting severely low functioning (at or below the **first** percentile) in **two or more** areas of adaptive functioning as per DSM-IV (functional academics, communication, home living, use of community resources, health and safety, leisure, self-care, social skills, self-direction, work);
- OR
- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of a medical condition associated with intellectual disability (e.g., Down Syndrome) that is not covered by a separate ISA profile; **and**
- ☐ Within the past **two** years, an assessment report documenting severely low functioning (at or below the **first** percentile) in **two or more** areas of adaptive functioning as per DSM-IV (functional academics, communication, home living, use of community resources, health and safety, leisure, self-care, social skills, self-direction, work); **and**
- ☐ Within the past **two** years, an educational assessment report based on the results of standardized assessments, indicating academic achievement at or below the **first** percentile.
- OR
- ☐ A completed ISA Confidential Assessment Summary (Developmental Disability) that:
 - ☐ Meets the criterion of one of the above options; **and**
 - ☐ Is signed by a member of the College of Psychologists.

ISA LEVEL 2	ISA LEVEL 3
Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) Frequent difficulty with: ☐ Basic living skills relative to the student's age; and ☐ Social skills relative to the student's age; and ☐ Self-control relative to student's age, exhibited by one or more of the following: ☐ problems inhibiting impulsive behaviour (e.g., not waiting turn, running, wandering) ☐ problems inhibiting aggressive behaviour (e.g., yelling, kicking, biting, punching) ☐ problems initiating appropriate behaviour (e.g., overly passive, unresponsive)	Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation) Difficulty, all or almost all of the time, with: ☐ Basic living skills; and ☐ Social skills; and ☐ Self-control relative to the student's age exhibited by one or more of the following: ☐ problems inhibiting impulsive behaviour (e.g., not waiting turn, running, wandering) ☐ problems inhibiting aggressive behaviour (e.g., yelling, kicking, biting, punching) ☐ problems initiating appropriate behaviour (e.g., overly passive, unresponsive)

**Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 7.2/7.3 – Intellectual Disability
(continued)**

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ Modified and/or alternative curriculum expectations for 51% to 80% of the program to address the development of: ☐ basic living skills; and ☐ social skills; and ☐ self-control skills; and ☐ basic literacy and numeracy skills; and ☐ Programming to address identified delays in communication skills (e.g., listening, understanding, expressing verbal or written thoughts through simple language).	Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP: ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ Alternative curriculum expectations for 81% to 100% of the program to address the development of: ☐ basic living skills; and ☐ social skills; and ☐ self-control skills; and ☐ basic literacy and numeracy skills as appropriate; and ☐ Programming to address severely limited (typically non-verbal) means of communication.
Evidence of Intensive Support Required: ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that specialized support personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, qualified speech/language pathologist) provide frequent support during the school day to address the identified needs.	Evidence of Intensive Support Required: ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by, or in conjunction with, a qualified special education teacher; and ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that specialized support personnel (e.g., education assistant, child and youth worker, qualified speech/language pathologist) provide almost constant support during the school day to address the identified needs.

CONFIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

(Intellectual Disability)

Student Number: _____

Last Name of Student:	First Name:	Gender	DOB (dd / mm / yyyy)	
		☐ M ☐ F		
Address:				
School Name:		Grade/ Placement:		

☐ **DIAGNOSIS OF A DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY**

Diagnosis (DSM-IV Code): ☐ 318.0 ☐ 318.1 ☐ 318.2 ☐ 319

Diagnosed by: _____ Profession:¹ _____
Date: _____

¹ Must be a member of either the College of Psychologists or the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

OR

☐ **INTELLECTUAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

(The overall composite score – e.g., Full Scale IQ² – must be at or below the 1st percentile)

Assessed by: _____ Date: _____
Title: _____

Test	Type of Score (e.g., FSIQ, GCA)	Percentile

² WISC-III scores must be based on Canadian norms.

☐ **ADAPTIVE FUNCTIONING RESULTS**

(Two or more scores must be at or below the 1st percentile. Scores must have been obtained within two years of claim submission.)

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
Title: _____

Assessment Measure	Area of Adaptive Functioning ³	Percentile

OR

³ As per DSM-IV

THIS SUMMARY IS CONFIDENTIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE REPRODUCED.

LAST NAME, First Name _____

DOB: [dd/mm/yyyy] _____

☐ **DIAGNOSIS OF A MEDICAL CONDITION ASSOCIATED WITH AN INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY**

Diagnosis: _____

Diagnosed by:⁴ _____ Date: _____

⁴ Must be a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

☐ **ADAPTIVE FUNCTIONING RESULTS**

(Two or more scores must be at or below the 1st percentile. Scores must have been obtained within two years of claim submission.)

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
Title: _____

Assessment Measure	Area of Adaptive Functioning ⁵	Percentile

⁵ As per DSM-IV

☐ **EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

Assessed by: Name: _____ Date: _____
Title: _____

Assessment Measure	Subtest	Percentile ⁶

⁶ Must be at or below first percentile.

I⁷ attest to the accuracy of this information:

Name (please print)

Title

Signature

Date

⁷ Must be a member of the College of Psychologists.

THIS SUMMARY IS CONFIDENTIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE REPRODUCED.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 8.2/8.3 – Blind

Claims that meet this profile represent a student who is legally blind and who will learn/uses Braille.

Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or a member of the College of Optometrists that a student is legally blind (i.e., 20/200 Imperial or 6/60 metric) or has a severe field restriction;
- AND**
- ☐ An assessment report that demonstrates that the student requires Braille in order to access the curriculum. Assessments may include a Functional Vision Assessment, a Tactile Readiness Assessment, or a Braille/Print Medium Assessment.

ISA LEVEL 2

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

- ☐ Inability to access the curriculum without the intervention of a qualified teacher of the blind.

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the blind or staff from the appropriate provincial school; **and**
- ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; **and**
- ☐ Program includes curriculum expectations that address the identified vision needs of the student.

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the blind for **25% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the blind are included in the ISA file;

OR
- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the blind or staff from the appropriate provincial school, in conjunction with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., qualified special education teacher, Braille transcriber, orientation and mobility instructor, and/or education assistant knowledgeable in the area of blindness) for a total of **25% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the blind are included in the ISA file.

ISA LEVEL 3

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

- ☐ Inability to access the curriculum without the intervention of a qualified teacher of the blind.

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program is developed by, or in conjunction with, a qualified teacher of the blind or staff from the appropriate provincial school; **and**
- ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; **and**
- ☐ Program includes curriculum expectations that address the identified vision needs of the student.

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the blind for **50% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the blind are included in the ISA file;

OR
- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered by a qualified teacher of the blind or staff from the appropriate provincial school, in conjunction with a range of specialized support personnel (e.g., qualified special education teacher, Braille transcriber, orientation and mobility instructor, and/or education assistant knowledgeable in the area of blindness) for a total of **50% or more** of the instructional week; **and**
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the blind are included in the ISA file.

Note: Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profile 8.3 – Deaf-Blind

Claims that meet this profile represent a student who is educationally deaf-blind.

Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or an assessment by an audiologist who is a member of the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists indicating a hearing loss;
AND
- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the College of Optometrists indicating a vision loss;
AND
- ☐ An assessment report* by a qualified teacher of the deaf-blind that specifies that the student is educationally deaf-blind.

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program* is developed by a qualified teacher of the deaf-blind; **and**
- ☐ Program includes extensive accommodations, as well as specialized intervention and teaching strategies; **and**
- ☐ Program includes modified and/or alternative curriculum that addresses the identified vision and hearing needs of the deaf-blind

Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that the program is delivered for **100%** of the instructional day by an intervener working under the supervision of a classroom teacher and in consultation with a qualified teacher of the deaf-blind;
 - ☐ Qualifications of the teacher of the deaf-blind are included in the ISA file.

*Assessment and Program may be completed by the appropriate provincial school.

Criteria for ISA Claims Submitted for Profiles 9.2/9.3 – Physical/ Health Disability

Claims that meet this profile represent a student with a permanent or long-term physical disability or medical condition who requires personal assistance, accommodations, or modifications in learning environments.

Evidence of:

- ☐ A formal diagnosis by a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons which specifies a permanent or long-term physical disability or medical condition;
- AND**
- ☐ Within the past two years a report completed by a member of the College of Occupational Therapists, the College of Physiotherapists, or the College of Physicians and Surgeons that documents:
 - ☐ the extent and severity of the disability or condition; and
 - ☐ the need for assistance with personal care and activities of daily living.

ISA LEVEL 2

ISA LEVEL 3

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

Evidence of Related Difficulties: (may be found in any of the following: assessments, anecdotal reports, supporting documentation)

Significant difficulty with:

Consistent, extreme difficulty with:

- ☐ Personal care and activities of daily living requiring:
 - ☐ frequent assistance; and
 - ☐ direct intervention from a range of specialized personnel; and
 - ☐ significant accommodations.

- ☐ Personal care and activities of daily living requiring:
 - ☐ assistance all or almost all of the time; and
 - ☐ extensive direct intervention from a range of specialized personnel; and
 - ☐ extensive accommodations.

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

Evidence of Needs and Program as Indicated in IEP:

- ☐ Program includes:
 - ☐ specialized intervention and teaching strategies designed by a range of professionals (e.g., special education and/or classroom teacher, physical/occupational therapist, qualified speech/language pathologist);
 - ☐ significant accommodations addressing the identified needs and allowing access to the curriculum.

- ☐ Program includes:
 - ☐ specialized intervention and teaching strategies designed by a range of professionals (e.g., special education and/or classroom teacher, physical/occupational therapist, qualified speech/language pathologist);
 - ☐ significant accommodations addressing the identified needs and allowing access to the curriculum.

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

Evidence of Intensive Support Required:

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that program support from a range of professionals, as well as specialized support personnel employed by the school board (e.g., personal care/health care assistant, education assistant, technology assistant), is provided for 50% or more of the school day.

- ☐ IEP and timetable indicate that program support from a range of professionals, as well as specialized support personnel employed by the school board (e.g., personal care/health care assistant, education assistant, technology assistant), is provided for 80% or more of the school day.

ISA Claims Validation Process for School Authorities

School authorities usually operate a single school in an isolated area or a school in a children's treatment centre or hospital. They are funded outside the Ministry of Education's student-focused funding grant structure.

Funding for school authorities for ISA levels 2 and 3 flows from the School Authority Grants.

For the 2001-02 year, school authorities will undergo the same review process as district school boards for ISA level 2 and 3 claims, with the exception that 100% of the claims submitted by school authorities will be reviewed by ministry validators. Funding for 2001-02 will continue for school-authority students who were approved in the previous year and who are in attendance at school-authority schools on September 1, 2001.

The validation process for 2001-02 will provide "live" funding to school authorities in 2002-03 for new claims found eligible by validators (provided all claims are validated by mid-January 2002).

Funding for school authorities for both approved ISA claims and high-needs students entering the system "in-year" will be allocated on a month-by-month basis. In-year claims will be reviewed on a monthly basis by education officers in the ministry's district offices. Funding will be based on attendance multiplied by the respective ISA 2 and 3 rates.

School authorities and education officers in the district offices will be invited to participate in the August 2001 comprehensive training sessions on the ISA process and the clarified eligibility criteria.

Validators will visit the district offices early in the 2001-02 comprehensive review process to review all claims submitted. Validation of school authority claims is expected to be complete by mid-January 2002.

Disclosure of Confidential Student Information

As in previous years, it is expected that in most instances all documentation required to support the ISA review will be filed in a student's Ontario Student Record (OSR).

The provisions that govern access to OSRs allow district school board administrators to disclose students' personal information and assessment reports to the Ministry of Education's validators for review. As in past years, boards are required under the province's privacy legislation to provide notice to parents about the disclosure of personal information on students for the purposes of the ISA review.

Where supporting documentation is not filed in a student's OSR, written parental consent is required for disclosure of the documentation to the ministry's validators.

Glossary of Terms

Accommodations: Teaching strategies, supports, and/or services required to help a student access the curriculum and demonstrate learning. The following are examples of individual accommodations:

- giving students extra time to complete classroom assignments
- allowing students to complete tasks or present information in alternative ways
- providing students with various learning tools, such as calculators or adaptive computers, to help them complete tasks
- providing scribes for students who need assistance with writing
- using pictorial schedules to help students make transitions.

Activities of daily living: See Basic Living Skills.

Adaptive functioning: The ability to adapt to and manage one's surroundings; that is, the ability to effectively meet social and community expectations for personal independence, physical needs, and interpersonal relationships. Adaptive functioning skills vary with age and must therefore be considered in relation to the social expectations for most individuals at a given age level. The American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* (DSM-IV), lists 10 areas of adaptive functioning, many of which can be evaluated through the use of instruments such as the Vineland Adaptive Behaviours Scale, Scales of Independent Behaviour-Revised, or the Adaptive Behaviour Scales. In addition, communication skills may be evaluated through speech/language pathology assessments and functional academics through formal educational assessments.

Amplification or specialized communication supports: Examples include hearing aids, sound field systems, speech analysers, auditory verbal therapy, and sign language.

Baseline: An approved group of files that boards need no longer submit for ISA validation.* The initial baseline will consist of three types of files: (1) files that were reviewed and approved during the 2000 ISA claim process, (2) files whose profile met a 90% approval rate threshold for the 2000 claim process, and (3) files that were reviewed and approved during the 2001 pilot test.

**Note: In future years, the government may implement a periodic review of all files or of files in some profiles.*

Basic living skills: Skills that people require to meet their basic needs at a given age level; for example, self-feeding, self-dressing, and toileting skills. As social environments and expectations become more complicated, basic living skills encompass such things as the ability to use public transportation, to shop, and to ask for directions.

Comorbid disorders: Two or more psychological or psychiatric disorders that co-occur in the same person and that are recognized as having a statistically significant association.

Composite score: On a test of intellectual ability, the aggregate score produced from various subtest scores.

Conduct disorder: A psychiatric disorder that involves a "repetitive and persistent pattern of behaviour in which the basic rights of others or major age-appropriate societal norms or rules are violated" (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* [DSM-IV]). The disorder takes two forms: Child-Onset Type (onset prior to 10 years of age) and Adolescent-Onset Type.

Current program (preschool deaf): Program that outlines the accommodations, interventions, and teaching strategies, as well as the expectations, that address the identified language needs of a preschool deaf/hard-of-hearing child.

Curriculum-alternative expectations: Expectations that are not derived from an Ontario (provincial) curriculum document or that are modified so extensively that the Ontario curriculum expectations no longer form the basis of the student's educational program.

Curriculum-modified expectations: Expectations that are derived from an Ontario (provincial) curriculum policy document for a grade level or for grade levels above or below the student's age-appropriate grade level.

Developmental disabilities: Conditions in which a person's overall level of assessed intellectual ability *and* adaptive functioning is significantly lower than expected for someone of the person's age. For the purposes of validating ISA claims, eligibility under Profile 7 (Intellectual Disability) has been set at or below the first percentile.

Diagnosis: The identification of a disease or disorder. Under the Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, "communicating to the individual or his or her personal representative a diagnosis identifying a disease or disorder as the cause of symptoms of the individual in circumstances in which it is reasonably foreseeable that the individual or his or her personal representative will rely on the diagnosis" is a "controlled act" (section 27(2)(1)). As such, it can only be performed by a person who "is a member authorized by a health profession Act to perform the controlled act...." (also section 27(2)(1)).

A diagnosis is usually rendered by a physician. Psychologists may diagnose conditions within their scope of practice. Psychological associates may communicate a diagnosis following successful completion of a process established by the college that regulates their profession. Optometrists may diagnose disorders or diseases of the eyes or visual system. Occupational therapists may communicate a dysfunction, but they are not authorized to communicate a diagnosis.

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV): This manual, published by the American Psychiatric Association, is widely used in North America as the most authoritative guide for diagnosing psychiatric and/or psychological disorders. The most recent version is DSM-IV-TR (Text Revision), published in 2000.

DSM-IV: See *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*, above.

Executive functioning: High-level cognitive processes such as planning a task, evaluating success, and correcting performance based upon the evaluation. Executive functioning includes processes that are sometimes referred to as "meta-cognitive"; that is, the abilities needed to reflect upon and learn about one's own learning style.

First-party document: The original, or a copy of an original, document that was completed and signed by the appropriate regulated professional.

Functional academics: Basic academic skills that one applies to real-life problems. Examples include telling time, making change, reading survival words (e.g., *exit*, *danger*, *keep out*), recognizing signs and icons (e.g., traffic signs, symbols for poison, symbols for public washrooms).

Global developmental delay: Significantly limited abilities across a wide range of important skill areas relative to most people of the same age. This term, used most frequently by pediatricians, is *not* a formal diagnostic category in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* (DSM-IV).

Grandparenting: For the purposes of the ISA comprehensive review, a process that uses the results of a board's 2000 ISA review to transfer files directly into the board's baseline of ISA-eligible files, with no need for the board to resubmit the files. The process is intended to reduce boards' administrative burdens related to file preparation. (See also *Baseline*.)

Note: A file must meet specific criteria before it can be grandparented.

IEP: See Individual Education Plan, below.

Individual Education Plan (IEP): A written plan describing the special education program and/or services required by a particular student. IEPs may identify learning expectations that are modified from or alternative to the expectations set out in the Ministry of Education's curriculum policy document for the appropriate grade and subject or course. IEPs also identify any accommodations and special education services the student needs to help him or her achieve his or her learning expectations.

Note: For the purposes of the ISA Comprehensive Review 2001-02, the IEP developed and in use for the 2000-01 school year may be submitted as documentation in cycle 1. For all other cycles, the 2001-02 IEP is required.

Intellectual disabilities: Broad intellectual deficiencies or those that fall across many areas of intellectual ability, such that the overall estimate of a person's intellectual ability falls well below the average for that person's age.

“Live” funding: Funding allocations that are based exclusively on the results of the ISA claims review process.

ODD: See Oppositional defiant disorder, below.

Oppositional defiant disorder (ODD): “The essential feature of ODD is a recurrent pattern of negativistic, defiant, disobedient, and hostile behaviour toward authority figures that persists for at least 6 months.” (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* [DSM-IV]) According to DSM-IV, a number of additional, specific characteristics must be met before a formal diagnosis of ODD can be made.

PDD/ASD: See Pervasive developmental disorder/autism spectrum disorder, below.

Pervasive developmental disorder/autism spectrum disorder (PDD/ASD): A wide diagnostic category that includes Autistic Disorder, Rett’s Disorder, Childhood Disintegrative Disorder, Asperger’s Disorder, and PDD Not Otherwise Specified (including Atypical Autism) (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition* [DSM-IV]).

Personal care: Personal assistance provided to students. Examples include physical management, physical/occupational therapy intervention, adaptive equipment setup, and supervision for safety reasons.

Professional assessment: An assessment conducted by a member of the regulated professions; also, a formal educational assessment.

Qualified Special Education Teacher, Qualified Teacher of the Blind, Qualified Teacher of the Deaf, Qualified Teacher of the Deaf-Blind: Teachers who hold a minimum of Part 1, Ministry of Education Additional Qualifications, or the equivalent in the appropriate exceptionality.

Self-advocacy: The ability of individuals to confidently and assertively communicate their personal learning needs, based on their knowledge and awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. Elementary school children need to learn to ask for help when they need it and to accept help and accommodations that are offered without feeling embarrassed and without sacrificing self-esteem. Secondary school students need to be able to choose courses on the basis of their knowledge of their personal strengths and weaknesses, and to actively seek out and take advantage of accommodations and resources.

Self-control: The ability to initiate or demonstrate behaviour that is appropriate and effective within a social context, and to inhibit or not demonstrate behaviour that is inappropriate or maladaptive.

Typically non-verbal: Unable to use words to communicate in a meaningful way.